

**UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL
RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT**

National Center for Education Statistics

CFDA NO. 84.902A

**REDESIGN OF THE NATIONAL ASSESSMENT
OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS**

APPLICATION FOR COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT

DATED MATERIAL - OPEN IMMEDIATELY

ISSUE DATE: DECEMBER 20, 1996

DUE DATE: FEBRUARY 6, 1997

Table of Contents

Department of Education's General Education Provisions Act (GEPA)	1
Letter to Prospective Applicants	4
Application Transmittal Instructions	6
Notice Inviting Applicants FY 97 Awards	7
Evaluation Criteria	8
Application Narrative	11
Application Forms	23
Budget Forms	26
Non-Construction Program Assurances	31
Certifications Regarding Lobbying, Debarment, Suspension and other Responsibility Matters; and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements	33
Certifications Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility and Voluntary Exclusion - Lower Tier Covered Transactions	35
Disclosure of Lobbying Activities	36
Important Notice to Prospective Participants in USDE Contract and Grants Programs	38
Authorizing Legislation	Appendix A
NAEP References	Appendix B

Letter to Prospective Applicants

Issue Date: December 20, 1996

Closing Date: February 6, 1997

Dear Prospective Applicant:

Thank you for your interest in the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) Redesign Activity. This is an effort that was precipitated by the recent policy of the National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB) to make NAEP even more useful to the general public and to policymakers.

Enclosed is an application package containing the instructions and forms necessary to apply for a Fiscal Year 1997 cooperative agreement for this project (CFDA No. 84.902A) and the Notice Inviting Applications for this project.

A cooperative agreement differs from a grant in that a cooperative agreement provides for mutual participation by the two parties, the funding agency and the recipient. A cooperative agreement differs from a contract in that a cooperative agreement provides greater flexibility in the relationship between these two parties. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) expects to collaborate closely with the recipient in carrying out the mission of the National Assessment of Educational Progress. This collaboration will include some NCES involvement in developing the redesign and reviewing reports. The intent of the collaboration is to reach mutually agreeable decisions with the recipient being given full opportunity to express his/her views.

A number of documents related to the redesign of NAEP are enclosed: (1) The NAGB policy on the redesign of NAEP identifies the focus for the redesign (emphasize achievement results over contextual information, audience specified as general public, maintenance of stable test frameworks, tests, and schedule, vary testing and reporting, and simplify analysis procedures); (2) The NAGB Design/Feasibility Team Report reviews issues related to NAEP, the need for redesign, and some possible alternatives; and (3) The draft National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) paper "An Operational Vision for NAEP—Year 2000 and Beyond" explicates the National Center for Education Statistics view of the NAEP redesign.

Please review the enclosed materials and carefully follow the instructions for completing your application. Be sure that your application complies with each requirement and is submitted by the closing date specified on the Notice Inviting Applications.

Proposed projects will be reviewed and ranked by a panel composed of readers with backgrounds in psychometrics, statistics, educational policy and educational research. It is anticipated that awards will be announced by mid to late February 1997.

The U.S. Department of Education requires applicants to submit an original and two copies of an application. Upon receipt of your application, the Department's Application Control Center will assign an identification number that will be entered on a postcard and returned to you. Please refer to this number in any future correspondence concerning your application.

The original and two copies of your application must be mailed directly to the U.S. Department of Education Application Control Center, Attention: CFDA Number 84.902A, 600 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20202-4725. In addition, it is requested that you submit an additional eight copies to the National Center for Education Statistics, Room 404g, 555 New Jersey Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20208-5653, Attention: Steve Gorman.

If you have any questions or need additional information concerning the program or the application process, please contact Steve Gorman of my staff at (202) 219-1937 (Internet: sgorman@inet.ed.gov).

Again, thank you for your interest in the redesign of NAEP.

Sincerely,

Pascal D. Forgione, Ph.D.
Commissioner

Enclosures

EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Secretary will use the following criteria to evaluate applications to this program in accordance with 34 C.F.R. 700.3 and 700.30. Weights have been assigned to each criterion indicating its relative importance in the evaluation process. The criteria are:

(1) *Quality of the project design.* (50)

- (I) The Secretary will consider the quality of the design of the proposed project.
- (ii) In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, the Secretary will consider the following factors:
 - (A) Whether there is a conceptual framework underlying the proposed activities and the quality of that framework.
 - (B) Whether a specific research design has been proposed, and the quality and appropriateness of that design, including the scientific rigor of the studies involved.
 - (C) The extent to which the research design includes a thorough, high-quality review of the relevant literature, a high-quality plan for research activities, and the use of appropriate theoretical and methodological tools, including those of a variety of disciplines, where appropriate.

(2) *Quality and potential contributions of personnel.* (25)

- (I) The Secretary will consider the quality and potential contributions of personnel for the

proposed project.

(ii) In determining the quality and potential contributions of personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary will consider the following factors:

(A) The qualifications, including training and experience, of the project director or principal investigator.

(B) The qualifications, including training and experience, of key project personnel.

(C) The qualifications, including training and experience, of proposed consultants or subcontractors.

(3) *Adequacy of resources.* (10)

(I) The Secretary will consider the adequacy of resources for the proposed project.

(ii) In determining the adequacy of resources for the proposed project, the Secretary will consider the following factors:

(A) Whether the budget is adequate to support the project.

(B) Whether the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the project.

(4) *Quality of the management plan.* (15)

(I) The Secretary will consider the quality of the management plan of the proposed project.

(ii) In determining the quality of the management plan of a proposed project, the Secretary will consider the following factors:

(A) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the project, including the specification of staff responsibility, timeliness, and benchmarks for accomplishing project tasks.

(B) Whether time commitments of the project director or principal investigator and other key personnel are appropriate and adequate to meet project objectives.

(C) The adequacy of plans for widespread dissemination of project results and products in ways that will assist others to use the information.

APPLICATION NARRATIVE

Before preparing the Application Narrative, read carefully the description of the program and the evaluation criteria that the Secretary uses to evaluate applications. The panelists who will review the applications and make recommendations to the Secretary will evaluate the applications according to the evaluation criteria provided in this application package.

To facilitate fair consideration of the merits of all applications, you are encouraged to organize the application narrative as follows:

1. Begin with an abstract, that is, a 500 word summary of the proposed project that includes statements about which of the redesign topic(s) will be addressed.
2. Describe the proposed project in light of each of the evaluation criteria in the order in which they are listed in the application package.
3. Include any other pertinent information that might be useful in reviewing the application.

INTRODUCTION

History of NAEP

The basic goal of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) is to provide data on the current status and long-term trends of the educational attainments of U.S. students and contextual information related to those attainments. The underpinnings of NAEP were based upon:

- ☐ Assessment of subject areas that are usually taught in school.
- ☐ Use of a consensus approach to the development of objectives for a subject area.
- ☐ Assessment of three age groups (9-, 13-, and 17-year-olds) of students.
- ☐ Use of multi-stage probability sampling, involving approximately 9,000 students per age/grade per subject assessed.
- ☐ Repeated use of some test items to permit comparisons over time.
- ☐ Matrix sampling to minimize response burden placed on schools and respondents.
- ☐ Combined use of multiple-choice and open-ended exercises.
- ☐ Analysis and reporting of results by age/grade levels for reporting groups.

Between 1964 and 1969, initial assessment planning and development activities were conducted for NAEP with support from both the Carnegie Corporation and the Ford Foundation. During this time, objectives and exercises were developed for many of the subject areas, sampling and data collection strategies were planned, and data analysis plans were formulated and outlined.

From its beginnings, NAEP developed assessments through an extensive consensus process. In this process, educators, scholars, and lay persons designed objectives for each subject area, proposing general goals which they thought Americans should achieve in the course of their education. The objectives were then converted into item specifications. After careful reviews, the item specifications were given to item writers, who developed measurement instruments appropriate to the specifications.

After the items underwent extensive reviews by subject-matter specialists, measurement experts, and lay persons, and were field tested in schools throughout the country, they were administered to a stratified multi-stage national probability sample. The young people sampled were selected so that assessment results could be generalized to the entire national student population of the NAEP age groups.

NAEP collected data for the first time in 1969. Since that time, samples have included over one million 9-, 13-, and 17-year-old students and, as funding would allow, 17-year-olds who had left school and adults 26 to 35 years of age.

NAEP's First Redesign

NAEP was administered by the Education Commission of the States (ECS) from 1969 through 1983. In 1982, a planning competition was held in order to develop cost-efficient imaginative alternative designs to conduct NAEP. For that NAEP redesign, the main question addressed was how to enhance NAEP's explanatory, evaluative, or interpretive qualities.

As a result of that redesign, a number of changes were made, including:

- ☐ Collection of grade level data.
- ☐ Uniform age definitions.
- ☐ Uniform assessment administration dates.
- ☐ Expansion of the number of background items.
- ☐ Collection of enlarged background data on teachers and principals.
- ☐ Utilization of Item Response Theory for item analysis and scale development.
- ☐ Imputation of ability estimates of individuals, facilitating analysis and reporting of results.

In 1983, Educational Testing Service (ETS) won the grant competition and assumed responsibility for administration of the project. In 1986, the Secretary of Education convened a Study Group on National Assessment chaired by Lamar Alexander, then Governor of Tennessee, and later U.S. Secretary of Education. In its year-long deliberations, the Study Group examined ways to improve NAEP. Its report, *The Nation's Report Card*, contained a number of recommendations, many of which are reflected in Public Law 100-297 and later in Public Law 103-382.

Further Changes to NAEP

The National Assessment of Educational Progress Improvement Act, Part C of the Augustus F. Hawkins-Robert T. Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvements Amendments of 1988 (Part C of Public Law 100-297), defined the purpose of NAEP to be "to improve the effectiveness of our nation's schools by making objective information about student

performance in selected learning areas available to policy makers at the national, State and local levels. To enhance its utility, such information should be both representative and comparable and should be maintained in a manner that ensures the privacy of individual students and their families." The Act continues with this explicit statement: "The purpose of the National Assessment is the assessment of the performance of children and adults in the basic skills of reading, mathematics, science, writing, history/geography, and other areas selected by the [National Assessment Governing] Board." The most important aspect of the National Assessment is its ability to report trends in student performance over time. NAEP must maintain the capacity to report results of each new assessment on the same metric as past assessments.

Public Law 100-297 restructured the National Assessment and authorized NAEP to report directly to the Commissioner of Education Statistics at the National Center for Education Statistics. Among the major changes were:

1. the establishment of a National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB) that provides NCES with advice on how to carry out the assessments, and
2. the authorization of Trial State Assessments in 1990, 1992, and 1994.

Other provisions called for assessments of adult literacy, protection of the confidentiality of the assessment data, ongoing reviews of NAEP, an independent evaluation of the Trial State Assessments, and a report to Congress and the public on NCES's plans for and conduct of the 1990, 1992 and 1994 assessments.

The Improving America's Schools Act, Title IV of Public Law 103-382, authorized State and National assessments under the NAEP program for an additional three years, and dropped the prohibition on providing school district results.

The National Assessment is carried out by the Commissioner of Education Statistics with the advice of NAGB. NAGB is responsible for establishing policies and guidelines for NAEP. In addition, NAGB shall:

- ☐ Select subject areas to be assessed;
- ☐ Develop appropriate student performance levels;
- ☐ Develop assessment objectives and test specifications through a national consensus approach;
- ☐ Design the methodology of the assessment in consultation with appropriate technical experts, including the Advisory Council for Education Statistics;
- ☐ Develop guidelines for reporting and disseminating results;

- Develop standards and procedures for interstate, regional and national comparisons; and,
- Take appropriate actions needed to improve the form and use of the National Assessment.

The Current Redesign of the National Assessment of Educational Progress

The National Assessment Governing Board, under its authority under the last bullet above, passed policies for the redesign of NAEP for the year 2000. The anticipated actions during the following year include simultaneously conducting:

- 1) this redesign planning grant,
- 2) conducting a competition for commissioned papers to resolve a number of intractable issues related to NAEP and other large scale assessments, and
- 3) surveying State education policymakers to identify their requirements.

In addition, next spring, a number of public forums are planned to discuss the implementation of various redesign alternatives. The results of the redesign planning grant, commissioned papers and public forums will culminate in one or more cooperative agreement announcements to conduct NAEP for the year 2000 and beyond.

To understand the nature of the National Assessment project as well as the nature of NAEP data, applicants are urged to study the details of the NAEP design features. The description of these features can be found in the NAEP references cited below. A copy of the current NAEP law can be found in Appendix A.

NAEP Study References

Some articles or reports addressing the redesign of NAEP are quite helpful for understanding the scope and direction of change requested for NAEP 2000. These documents are attached in Appendix B, and are also available on the Internet World Wide Web at <http://www.ed.gov/NCES/naep/currenta.html>.

An Operational Vision for NAEP—Year 2000 and Beyond (draft), dated November 4, 1996

The National Assessment Governing Board Policy Statement on Redesigning the National Assessment of Educational Progress, approved August 2, 1996

The National Assessment Governing Board Design Feasibility Team Report, August, 1996

Also of interest is:

Jones, L. A History of the National Assessment of Educational Progress and Some Questions About Its Future. *Educational Researcher*, October 1996, pp. 15-21.

Applicants are urged to examine the literature on the National Assessment as an aid to preparing proposals. A list of some of these reports is found in Appendix B.

Guidance for Completing Applications

Applicants are requested to submit the following:

A cover sheet, completed and signed (see Standard Form 524: Federal Assistance, in the Forms section of this package).

A narrative, describing the applicant's proposed activities and the technical approaches to redesigning the National Assessment of Educational Progress.

A budget for the proposed activities, showing number of personnel hours, other direct costs, and indirect cost rate.

An assurance that the grantee will comply with the requirements imposed by the Secretary concerning:

☐ Special requirements of law;

☐ Program requirements; and

☐ Administrative requirements.

Each applicant should submit an original and two copies of its application to the Department of Education Application Control Center, Attention: CFDA Number 84.902A, 600 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20202-4725 including any information that the applicant supplies voluntarily. The Department requests that an additional eight (8) copies be sent directly to NCES, 555 New Jersey Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20208-5653 for ease of review. An applicant may make changes to its application on or before the deadline date for submitting applications under the program.

NARRATIVE SECTION

General Information

The objectives of this project are to address innovative means to redesign NAEP in one or more of the following areas:

1. Development of methods to improve the collection of background and contextual information based on current research.
2. Establishment of innovative procedures to measure cognitive skills related to subject matter.
3. Development of sampling designs that optimize school and student sample size and minimize cost and standard error.
4. Creation of data collection procedures that reduce burden on students, teachers, and schools while enhancing the information available to the public on the academic performance and related contextual data of school children.
5. Development of scoring procedures for open-ended and constructed response items that are cost-effective, utilizing the latest technologies, while maintaining high scorer reliability.
6. Use of innovative psychometric procedures to calibrate, scale, score, link, and analyze NAEP data.
7. Development of analysis and reporting techniques that provide the public an initial release of results on a timely and predictable schedule.

Applications must include the number of labor hours, materials, contracts, etc. that are related to the proposed activities. The application should include the following:

- ☐ Information that addresses each selection criterion that applies to the program.
- ☐ A proposed project time line for the project.
- ☐ Information to demonstrate the applicant's capability to:
 - (1) conduct the project; and,
 - (2) meet the needs of the persons that the applicant plans to serve with the project.

- A budget for the period of the project.

Applicants are encouraged to present in the Narrative Section of the application sufficient information about the nature of the tasks and the approach to each of the NAEP activities, to enable reviewers to evaluate the proposed approach against the evaluation criteria.

Applications also should demonstrate the applicant's understanding of the nature and scope of the tasks, including the necessary subtasks, and the capability of successfully completing each task. Evidence of this understanding should be fully demonstrated in the application, since it will be deduced from the quality of the proposal.

Applicants must identify the project director, other key staff members, and any outside consultants who would be employed and assigned to each task and provide biographical information about each key staff member.

The applicant should also include in its proposed approach the estimated full time equivalent number of person-weeks required, broken down into professional, technical, and support staff categories. This representation should span the 3 month performance period.

Program Objectives

The following information is provided only as guidance to applicants in submitting applications. The following activities are only an example of activities that might be discussed in the application.

The potential innovations listed below are just a finite number of innovations, and applicants are strongly recommended not to be limited to these few ideas.

Activity 1. Prepare Draft Report on Innovative Redesign in One or More Areas.

The report should describe the proposed innovations, including technical considerations, risks, and potential implementation costs.

Because of the interrelationships of the seven NAEP components cited above, it is recommended that the grantee become familiar with the entire NAEP assessment process, from framework development to reporting.

1. Development of methods to improve the collection of background and contextual information based on current research.

Some possible innovations include using the following methods to develop high reliability measures of socioeconomic status (SES) surrogates, school engagement and parental involvement:

- ☐ Cognitive lab research procedures.
 - ☐ Focused groups.
 - ☐ Individual interviews.
2. Establishment of innovative procedures to measure cognitive skills related to subject matter.
- Some possible innovative procedures include:
- ☐ Computer-adapted assessment technology.
 - ☐ Computerized adaptive testing.
 - ☐ Paper-based branching/routing tests.
 - ☐ Measurement of cognitive subtasks.
3. Development of sampling and instrument designs which minimize school and student sample size and cost and standard error.
- Some possible innovations include:
- ☐ Reduction of State NAEP samples.
 - ☐ Optimization of National NAEP sample.
4. Creation of data collection procedures that reduce burden on students, teachers, and schools while enhancing the information available to the public on the performance and related contextual data of school children.
- Some possible procedures include:
- ☐ Improving the process to obtain teacher background questionnaire data for use as contextual information related to student cognitive data.
 - ☐ Identification of a core set of background variables most useful to policymakers and researchers.
 - ☐ Increasing motivation of students with interesting assessment materials or processes
 - ☐ Increasing school participation.

- ☐ Minimization of test fatigue.
- 5. Development of scoring procedures for open-ended and constructed response items that are cost-effective, utilizing the latest technologies, while maintaining high scorer reliability.
 - ☐ A possible innovative procedure is intelligent computer-aided scoring technology
- 6. Development of innovative psychometric procedures.

Possible innovative procedures include:

- ☐ Alternative scaling and linking procedures that reduce analysis and reporting time.
- ☐ Alternative Differential Item Functioning and Item Drift detection methods
- 7. Formulation of analysis and reporting techniques which provide the public an initial release of results on a timely and predictable schedule.

Alternative analysis techniques include:

- ☐ Domain market basket concept.
- ☐ Marginal maximum likelihood estimation instead of plausible values.

Alternative reporting techniques could be based upon targeted reports to different readers based upon the results of focus groups, surveys, and individual interviews.

Activity 2. Brief NCES Staff on Draft Report

Within 60 days of the award of this grant, grantees shall plan on a one-day trip to Washington, DC to describe the findings of the report to a small group of interested NCES personnel.

Activity 3. Write Final Report based upon NCES Comments

Based upon the comments, both written and oral, obtained from NCES, grantees should revise their final report and submit to NCES within 90 days of the award of this grant.

APPENDIX A

AUTHORIZING LEGISLATION

SEC. 411. NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS.

(a) Establishment.--The Commissioner shall, with the advice of the National Assessment Governing Board established under section 412, and with the technical assistance of the Advisory Council established under section 407, carry out, through grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements with one or more qualified organizations, or consortia thereof, a National Assessment of Educational Progress (hereafter in this title referred to as the ``National Assessment").

(b) Purpose; State Assessments.--

(1) Purpose.--The purpose of the National Assessment is to provide a fair and accurate presentation of educational achievement in reading, writing, and the other subjects included in the third National Education Goal, regarding student achievement and citizenship. The Commissioner, in carrying out the National Assessment, shall use sampling techniques that produce data that are representative on a national and regional basis, and on a State basis pursuant to paragraph (2). In addition, the Commissioner shall--

(A) collect and report data on a periodic basis, but at least once every two years, on students at ages 9, 13, and 17 and in grades 4, 8, and 12 in public and private schools;

(B) report achievement data on a basis that ensures valid and reliable trend reporting;

(C) include information on special groups, including, whenever feasible, information collected, cross-tabulated, analyzed, and reported by sex, race or ethnicity and socioeconomic status; and

(D) ensure that achievement data are made available on a timely basis following official reporting, in a manner that facilitates further analysis.

(2) State assessments.--

(A)(i) The Commissioner, in carrying out the National Assessment, may conduct State assessments of student achievement in grades 4, 8, and 12.

(ii) Each such State assessment, in each subject area and at each grade level, shall be conducted on a developmental basis until the Commissioner determines, as the result of an evaluation required by subsection (f), that such assessment produces high quality data that are valid and reliable.

(B)(i) States wishing to participate in State assessments shall enter into an agreement with the Secretary pursuant to subsection (d)(2).

(ii) Such agreement shall contain information sufficient to give States full information about the process for consensus decisionmaking on objectives to be tested, and the standards for sampling, test administration, test security, data collection, validation, and reporting.

(C) A participating State shall review and give permission for the release of results from any test of its students administered as a part of a State assessment prior to the release of such data. Refusal by a State to release its data shall not restrict the release of data from other States that have approved the release of such data.

(3) Prohibited data.--In carrying out the National Assessment, the Commissioner shall not collect any data that are not directly related to the appraisal of educational performance, achievement, and traditional demographic reporting variables, or to the fair and accurate presentation of such information.

(4) Technical assistance.--In carrying out the National Assessment, the Commissioner may provide technical assistance to States, localities, and other parties.

(c) Access.--

(1) Public access.--Except as provided in paragraph (2), the public shall have access to all data, questions, and test instruments of the National Assessment.

(2) Personally identifiable information.--

(A) The Commissioner shall ensure that all personally identifiable information about students, their educational performance, and their families, and that information with respect to individual schools, remains confidential, in accordance with section 552a of title 5, United States Code.

(B) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commissioner may decline to make available to the public for a period, not to exceed ten years after initial use, cognitive questions that the Commissioner intends to reuse in the future.

(d) Participation.--

(1) National and regional.--Participation in the national and regional assessments by State and local educational agencies shall be voluntary.

(2) State.--Participation in assessments made on a State basis shall be voluntary. The Commissioner shall enter into an agreement with any State that desires to carry out an assessment for the State under this subsection. Each such agreement shall contain provisions designed to ensure that the State will--

(A) participate in the assessment; and

(B) pay from non-Federal sources the non-Federal share of such participation.

(3) Non-federal share.--

(A) For each fiscal year, the non-Federal share for the purpose of paragraph (2)(B) shall be--

- (i) the cost of conducting the assessment at the school level for all public schools in the State sample;
 - (ii) the cost of coordination within the State; and
 - (iii) other reasonable costs specified by the Secretary in the agreement described in paragraph (2), such as the cost of analyzing and reporting the data.
- (B) The non-Federal share of payments under this paragraph may be in cash or in kind, fairly valued.
- (C) The agreement described in paragraph (2) shall describe the manner in which the costs of administering the assessment to private nonprofit schools included in the State sample will be met.

(e) Student Performance Levels.--

- (1) Performance levels.--The National Assessment Governing Board, established under section 412, shall develop appropriate student performance levels for each age and grade in each subject area to be tested under the National Assessment.

(2) Development of levels.--

(A) Such levels shall be--

- (i) devised through a national consensus approach, providing for active participation of teachers, curriculum specialists, local school administrators, parents, and concerned members of the general public;
- (ii) used on a developmental basis until the Commissioner determines, as the result of an evaluation under subsection (f), that such levels are reasonable, valid, and informative to the public; and
- (iii) updated as appropriate.

(B) In using such levels on a developmental basis, the Commissioner and the Board shall ensure that reports that use such levels do so in a manner that makes clear the developmental status of such levels.

(3) Reporting.--After determining that such levels are reasonable, valid, and informative to the public, as the result of an evaluation under subsection (f), the Commissioner shall use such levels or other methods or indicators for reporting results of the National Assessment and State assessments.

(f) Review of National and State Assessments.--

(1) In general.--

(A) The Secretary shall provide for continuing review of the National Assessment, State assessments, and student performance levels, by one or more nationally recognized evaluation organizations, such as the National Academy of Education and the National Academy of Sciences.

(B) Such continuing review shall address--

(i) whether each developmental State assessment is properly administered, produces high quality data that are valid and reliable, and produces data on student achievement that are not otherwise available to the State (other than data comparing participating States to each other and the Nation); and

(ii) whether developmental student performance levels are reasonable, valid, and informative to the public.

(2) Report.--The Secretary shall report to the Congress, the President, and the Nation on the findings and recommendations of such reviews.

(3) Use of findings and recommendations.--The Commissioner shall consider the findings and recommendations of such review

in designing the competition to select the organization, or organizations, through which the Commissioner carries out the National Assessment.

(g) Coverage Agreements.--

- (1) Department of Defense Schools.--The Secretary and the Secretary of Defense may enter into an agreement, including such terms as are mutually satisfactory, to include in the National Assessment elementary and secondary schools operated by the Department of Defense.
- (2) Bureau of Indian Affairs Schools.--The Secretary and the Secretary of the Interior may enter into an agreement, including such terms as are mutually satisfactory, to include in the National Assessment schools for Indian children operated or supported by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Appendix B

Recent NAEP Reports

A full description of current National Assessment design concepts can be found in the following reports:

Johnson, E., and Carlson, J. (1994). *The NAEP 1992 Technical Report*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

Several reports are available on the Internet World Wide Web at <http://www.ed.gov/NCES/naep>

Williams, P., Reese, C., Campbell, J., Mazzeo, J. and Phillips, G. *1994 NAEP Reading: A First Look*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

Persky, H., Reese, C., O'Sullivan, C., Lazer, S., Moore, J. and Shakrani, S. *NAEP 1994 Geography Report Card. Findings from the National Assessment of Educational Progress*. May 1996.

Beatty, A., Reese, C., Persky, H., and Carr, P. *NAEP 1994 U.S. History Report Card: Findings from the National Assessment of Educational Progress*. April 1996.

Campbell, J., Reese, C., O'Sullivan, C., and Dossey, J., *NAEP 1994 Trends in Academic Progress*, Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Nov, 1996.

1994 NAEP Data Almanac Viewer. (1996)

In addition, a number of research reports using data from past NAEP assessments are included in the ERIC system, and may be accessed therein.